Subject No. 82.

Trials before Taluk Magistrates to be with the aid of Assessors.

Mr. Sankariah of Heggadadevankote Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Provision may be made by the legislature that all trials before Taluk Magistrates may be conducted with the aid of not less than three Assessors selected out of the respectable inhabitants of the taluk.

Reply of Government.—Cannot be done.

Subject No. 83.

Prohibition of Cow Slaughter.

Messrs. Sidda Basava Devaru, Krishnappa of Mysore taluk, Sankarappa Narsimha Murti of Malvalli Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Cow slaughter should be prohibited.

Reply of Government.—Not possible.

Subject No. 84.

Prohibition of use of cows for ploughing purposes.

Messrs. Srinivasa Josier of Melkote, Sankarappa and Narasimha Murti of Malvalli Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—In many parts of the State cows are employed by the raiyats for ploughing their lands. This is a most objectionable practice and should be discontinued.

Reply of Government.—This is not a proper subject for legislation or Government interference.

Subject No. 85.

Opinion of the Representative Assembly Members in matters of legislation.

Mr. N. Srikantaiya of Mysore City Municipality.

Summary of discussion.—Opinions of Representative Members may be invited before Draft Regulations are passed into law. The Drafts published in the Gazette are not accessible to all, and should be placed before the Representative Assembly and discussed. Or there should be a Legislative Council as in Travancore. Non-official opinion should be taken in all cases.

Reply of Government.—All that is possible is being done. Copies of Draft Regulations will be circulated to those whose opinions are considered valuable. Government cannot bind itself to place all legislative measures before the Representative Assembly, and thereby unnecessarily delay their passing. [*Vide* also replies to Subjects Nos. 77 (*b*) and 170.]

EXCISE.

Subject No. 86.

Bagani Toddy.

Messrs. C. Srinivasa Rao of Chikmagalur and A. Shama Rao, North Mysore Planters' Association.

Summary of discussion.—The restrictions placed on Bagani toddy as regards malnad raiyats should be removed. These are laboring under great difficulties. The expression "domestic purpose" should be made to include jeetagar's drink. Jeetagars are not coolies, but form part of the landholder's family. They now drink bagani toddy surreptitiously; it would be a graceful act on the part of Government to grant the full concession as prayed for.

Reply of Government.—Noted.

Subject No. 87.

Tree-tax on shendi (date) trees in private holdings.

Messrs. D. Venkataramiah, Bangalore, Rangaiengar, Channapatna, and Linge Gowda, Mysore Taluk.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) The tax due to Government on date trees in the holdings of private individuals should be reduced.

(*b*) The income from date trees standing on private holdings (including inam lands) derived by the levy of tree-tax goes to Government and not to the holders. The latter should get the income. [In speaking on this topic,

Mr. D. Venkataramaiya referred to the original system under which the pattadar or holder used to arrange matters with the toddy contractor. During the Survey, tamarind trees were given to the pattadar for a valuation; if "malki" carried rights to tamarind trees, why not also to date trees. This was the Bombay system. The tree-tax system was introduced in 1897-98 after the Madras system. Since then no tree-rent has been received by holders except with effect from the current year. Holders are obliged to give applications for licenses to tap trees. Government should not take both the receipts from sale of shops and the tax on trees. Let the former or the monopoly price be retained by Government, and let the latter or the tree-tax be given to the land-holders. Or in the last resort, let the tree rent payable to them be increased.

Reply of Government.—The principle has been misunderstood. The toddy excise revenue has always been a Government monopoly and never belonged to private owners. The system has been changed from time to time, but the principle has been always recognized that toddy wherever found is an excisable article. The tree-tax represents such duty. Government does not object to holders cutting down date trees on their lands; but so long as they are left standing, if juice extracted therefrom is turned into toddy, it becomes liable to taxation.

Subject No. 88.
Inamdar's claim to Toddy Revenue.

Mr. Madappa of Mysore.

Summary of discussion.—(*a*) At the meeting held in 1899 it was promised that this question would be disposed of early, but the Government have not yet passed orders. The present tree-tax system deprives the Inamdars of their rights, and has the effect of transferring the tree-tax of one rupee per tree and the local cess of one anna levied on it entirely to the Government. The Government may be pleased to pass orders directing the payment of the balance of toddy revenue due to Inamdars entitled to the same.

Messrs. Amble Anniah Pandit; D. Narasimiah of Chamrajnagar Taluk.

(*b*) Inamdars entitled to the said revenue may be paid the tree tax, the Government taking only the local cess of one anna per rupee levied on the tree tax.

(*c*) The new Inamdars' Claims Rules should not be made retrospective. Grove-rent should be paid to all parties up to 1897. Also Inamdars do not get any benefit under these rules, where the villages are *bechirak*. In these respects the new Rules require alteration.

Mr. Anandalvar of Mandya Taluk.

(*d*) The contract amount of date trees on occupied lands and Inam villages may be fixed by Government.

Reply of Government.—The new Rules for the settlement of inamdars' claims will be translated presently and furnished to Members. Let them study these Rules, which were framed after due consideration.

Karnataka State Archives,
(Departmental Library)
ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ರಾಜ್ಯ ಪತ್ರಾಗಾರ
(ಇಲಾಖಾ ಗ್ರಂಥಾಲಯ)
ಪ್ರಾಪ್ತಿ ಕ್ರಮಾಂಕ Accession No. (B) 4582
ದಿನಾಂಕ Date

V-, 31 NO1
NO1
(B) 4582